



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,157	01/06/2001	Christian Stig Rode	RCI003V2R	5992
7590	06/07/2004		EXAMINER	PHAM, THOMAS K
CHRISTIAN S. RODE c/o RODE CONSULTING, INC. 2412 STEARNS HILL RD. WALTHAM, MA 02451			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	
DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/756,157	RODE, CHRISTIAN STIG <i>[Signature]</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas K Pham	2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5, 7 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6, 9 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

First Action on the Merits

Claim Objections

1. Claims 6, 9 and 10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim *should refer to other claims in the alternative only--, and/or, --cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.* See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.
2. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7 and 8 of U.S. Application 09/756,157 filed on 01/06/2001 are presented for examination.
3. Claims 1-5 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: all upper case letters after the first line in the claims should be change to lower cases (for example: claim 1 line 2, 4, 6, 9 and 12 etc.).
Also claims 1-5 & 7 are not a single sentence. Appropriate correction is required.
*AE
6/11/04*

Quotations of U.S. Code Title 35

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,826,242 ("Montulli")

Regarding claim 2

Montulli teaches limiting server use by a client, comprising: the client transmitting a request for a file or action (script) from the server, the request not accompanied by valid client state information (col. 2 lines 28-32, "The system also has a second computer ... the client can display the documents"). the server determining that the request is not accompanied by the valid client state information and redirecting client to a new file or action (script) accompanied by valid client state information after a human-significant (>1 second) delay (col. 7 lines 36-40, "In respond to the http request ... one or more cookies"), the client transmitting a new request for the new file or action (script), accompanied by one of i) the new client state information, ii) the original client state information or iii) no client state information (col. 7 lines 40-49, "Upon receiving the HTML ... to the server system"), the server verifying that the client state information accompanying the new request is the new client state information (col. 8 lines 40-62, "Client systems examine the ... along with the http request") and verifying that the client state information accompanying the new request is within acceptable limits to proceed with the new request (col. 7 lines 26-27, "when the client system ... within the range of defined URLs"), if the verification completely successful, the server fulfilling either i) the client request or ii) the client new request (col. 7 lines 6-11, "the HTML document contains ... a client to do anything else).

Regarding claim 8

Montulli teaches a network of computer systems comprising: a client system having a client

processor and a client computer readable medium coupled to the client processor, the client computer readable medium containing program instructions for receiving a state object which specifies state information and for storing the state object on the client computer readable medium (col. 7 lines 40-49, “Upon receiving the HTML … to the server system”); a server system having a server processor and a server computer readable medium coupled to the server processor, the server system coupled to the client system through a network medium, the server computer readable medium containing program instructions i) for transmitting a file from the server system to the client system and/or executing a process at client request (col. 7 lines 36-40, “In respond to the http request … one or more cookies”), ii) for transmitting the state object to the client system (col. 7 lines 19-25, “when a server responds … repeated back to”), iii) for updating server usage information in the state object and verifying the update has been accepted by client before client's request to transmit certain files or execute certain processes is fulfilled (col. 7 lines 26-27, “when the client system … within the range of defined URLs”).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 1, 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,826,242 (“Montulli”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,715,314 (“Payne”).

Regarding claim 1

Montulli teaches limiting server use by a client, comprising: the client transmitting a new request for the new file or action (script), accompanied by one of i) the the new client state information, ii) the original client state information or iii) no client state information (col. 7 lines 40-49, “Upon receiving the HTML … to the server system”), the server verifying that the client state

Art Unit: 2121

information accompanying the new request is the new client state information (col. 8 lines 40-62, “Client systems examine the … along with the http request”) and verifying that the client state information accompanying the new request is within acceptable limits to proceed with the new request (col. 7 lines 26-27, “when the client system … within the range of defined URLs”).

Montulli does not specifically teach the client transmitting a request for a file or action (script) from the server, the request accompanied by valid client state information, the server examining the client state information and redirecting client to a new file or action (script) accompanied by new client state information, if the verification completely successful, the server fulfilling either i) the client request or ii) the client new request. However, Payne teaches the client transmitting a request for a file or action (script) from the server (col. 5 lines 49-56, “buyer computer sending a purchase … to the payment computer”), the request accompanied by valid client state information (col. 6 lines 30-35, “If the user clicks on … user already has an account”), the server examining the client state information and redirecting client to a new file or action (script) accompanied by new client state information (col. 7 lines 31-36, “The payment computer then sends … URL using the cryptographic key (step 94)”), if the verification completely successful, the server fulfilling either i) the client request or ii) the client new request (col. 8 lines 3-13, “The payment computer verifies … URL for the shopping cart (step 114)” for the purpose of authenticating access with a merchant of specific products. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the authentication process of Payne with the client-server system of Montulli because it would provide for the purpose of authenticating access with a merchant of specific products.

Regarding claim 3

Montulli teaches limiting server use by a client, comprising: the client transmitting a request for a file or action (script) from the server, the request not accompanied by valid client state information (col. 2 lines 28-32, “The system also has a second computer … the client can display the documents”), the server determining that the request is not accompanied by the valid client state information and redirecting client to a form accompanied by valid client state information, the form containing information about the client's the request (col. 7 lines 19-25, “when a server responds … repeated back to”). Montulli does not teach a user of the client completing the form and submitting to the server, accompanied by one of i) the new client state information, ii) the original client state information or iii) no client state information, the server verifying that the client state information accompanying the submitted form is the new client state information and verifying that the client state information accompanying the new submitted form is within acceptable limits to proceed with the request, if the verification completely successful, the server fulfilling either i) the client request or ii) the client new request. However, Payne teaches a user of the client completing the form and submitting to the server, accompanied by one of i) the new client state information, ii) the original client state information or iii) no client state information (col. 6 lines 15-29, “If the user clicks … in the settlement database”), the server verifying that the client state information accompanying the submitted form is the new client state information and verifying that the client state information accompanying the new submitted form is within acceptable limits to proceed with the request (col. 6 lines 43-49, “The payment computer verifies … amount exceeds a threshold (step 73”)), if the verification completely successful, the server fulfilling either i) the client request or ii) the client new request (col. 8 lines 3-13, “The payment

computer verifies ... URL for the shopping cart (step 114)" for the purpose of authenticating access with a merchant of specific products. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the authentication process of Payne with the client-server system of Montulli because it would provide for the purpose of authenticating access with a merchant of specific products.

Regarding claim 4

Payne teaches if the verification not completely successful, the server optionally returning at least one of i) an error file or ii) a redirection to an error message file or action (script) (col. 6 lines 43-47, "The payment computer verifies ... network sale system is denied (step 74)" for the purpose of authenticating access with a merchant of specific products. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the authentication process of Payne with the client-server system of Montulli because it would provide for the purpose of authenticating access with a merchant of specific products.

Regarding claim 5

Payne teaches the server returning the error file or the redirection accompanied by further modified client state information, the further modified client state information reflecting a "credit" for that portion of the requested operation not completed (col. 6 lines 50-58, "If additional security ... network sales system is denied (step 83).

Regarding claim 7

Montulli teaches limiting server use by a client, comprising: the client transmitting a request for a file or script from the server (col. 2 lines 28-32, "The system also has a second computer ... the client can display the documents"), the client transmitting either the modified state information

or some other state information (col. 7 lines 40-49, "Upon receiving the HTML ... to the server system"), the server verifying that the client state information is the modified client state information and verifying that the modified client state information is within acceptable limits to proceed with the request (col. 7 lines 26-27, "when the client system ... within the range of defined URLs"), the server fulfills the client request (col. 7 lines 6-11, "the HTML document contains ... a client to do anything else), the server modifying the state information and transmitting the modified state information to the client (col. 7 lines 36-40, "In respond to the http request ... one or more cookies"), the client optionally replacing original state information with the modified state information (col. 7 lines 40-49, "Upon receiving the HTML ... to the server system"). Montulli does not teach the steps: the server requesting state information from the client, the client transmitting the state information, the server verifying that the client state information is not the modified client state information and verifying that the modified client state information is not within acceptable limits to proceed with the request, the server returns an error message or redirects the client to request an error message file. However, Payne teaches the server requesting state information from the client (col. 6 lines 10-14, "The confirmation document ... wishes to open one"), the client transmitting the state information (col. 6 lines 15-30, "If the user clicks ... in the settlement database (step 58)'), the server verifying that the client state information is not the modified client state information and verifying that the modified client state information is not within acceptable limits to proceed with the request, the server returns an error message or redirects the client to request an error message file (col. 6 lines 43-47, "The payment computer verifies ... network sale system is denied (step 74)") for the purpose of authenticating access with a merchant of specific products. Therefore, it would be obvious to

Art Unit: 2121

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the authentication process of Payne with the client-server system of Montulli because it would provide for the purpose of authenticating access with a merchant of specific products.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thomas Pham*; whose telephone number is (703) 305-7587 and fax number is (703) 746-8874, Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 7:30AM- 5:00PM EST or contact Supervisor *Mr. Anthony Knight* at (703) 308-3179.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to: **Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231**, or **Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia, (Receptionist located on the 4th floor)**, or fax to the **official fax number (703) 872- 9306**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Thomas Pham
Patent Examiner

TP
June 1, 2004



Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600